

**WRITTEN OPINION  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET)**PCT/EP2004/051042**Re Box V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statements**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: ATTACHMENT EXECUTIVE VERSION 3.0 [Online] July 2001 (2001-07),  
 pages 1-39, XP002296525. Found on the Internet:  
 URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20030301033209/madsolutions.com/documentation.htm> [found on 15 September 2004]
- D2: US 2003/115273 A1 (MA WILLIAM HSIOH-LIEN ET AL.) 19 June 2003  
 (2003-06-19)

2. The present application does not satisfy the requirements of PCT Article 33(2), because the subject matter of claims 1 and 7 is not novel.

The reasons are as follows:

2.1 D1 discloses, in conformity with the features of claim 1, a

Method for the user-based processing of electronic messages with file attachments ("attachment processing utility ... for Microsoft Outlook" in the section headed "Introduction" on page 7), said method having the following steps:

- (a) replacement of at least one file attachment of the electronic message by a memory location link to a user-selected memory location in a user file system to modify the electronic message ("This rule will process attachments that enter your mailbox and move them from the message to a location on the file system" and "the attachment will be replaced by a hyperlink to the file" in the second paragraph of the section headed "Step 1 - Rule Types" on page 12); and
- (b) saving of the at least one file attachment of the electronic message at the user-selected memory location in the user file system ("you will select the location for attachments" in the second paragraph of the section headed "Step 1 - Rule Types" on page 12).

The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore known from D1 and is thus not novel (PCT Article 33(1) and (2)).

The subject matter of claim 1 is also not novel compared with D2 (paragraphs 4, 11, 13, 17, 19 and 32-35), because said document likewise discloses a method for saving the file attachments of an electronic message, in which method the attachments are replaced by appropriate memory location links.

- 2.2 The same reasoning applies accordingly to independent claim 7.

The subject matter of claim 7 is thus also not novel (PCT Article 33(1) and (2)).

3. Dependent claims 3-6, 10 and 11 contain no additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which claims 3-6, 10 and 11 refer back, fulfill the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty. The reasons are as follows:

The features of dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 10 and 11 concerning the selection of the file names and rules when saving are known from publication D1 (pages 10-12 and 30-32).

The feature of claim 5 that the message is a message of an SMTP e-mail client is known from publication D1 ("Microsoft Outlook" in the section headed "Introduction" on page 7).

Dependent claims 3-6, 10 and 11 are therefore likewise not allowable (PCT Article 33(1) and (2)).

4. The combination of features in dependent claims 2, 8 and 9 is neither known from nor suggested by the present prior art. The reasons are as follows:

The feature in dependent claims 2, 8 and 9 that a message link to the modified electronic message is created at the memory location is not known from the present prior art and is therefore novel (PCT Article 33(1) and (2)).

The technical object to be achieved with the subject matter of claims 2, 8 and 9 can be considered such that a technical aid is provided to enable the electronic message relating to a saved file attachment to be easily retrieved.

To achieve this object, a person skilled in the art would select one of the options for automatically saving the file attachments with specific file names or directory names as described on pages 30-32 of publication D1 (e.g. the subject of the message) because he knows that the message can be easily retrieved therewith. A

**WRITTEN OPINION  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET)**

**International application No.**

**PCT/EP2004/051042**

person skilled in the art would not therefore arrive at the subject matter of claims 2, 8 and 9.

The subject matter of dependent claims 2, 8 and 9 therefore satisfies the requirements of the PCT with regard to the inventive step (PCT Article 33(1) and (3)).

**Re Box VI**

**Certain documents cited**

Certain published documents according to PCT Rule 70.10:

Patent No.	Publication date	Filing date	Priority date
DE10346897	26 August 2004	9 October 2003	6 February 2003
US2004/0158607	12 August 2004	6 February 2003	6 February 2003

**Re Box VII**

**Certain defects in the international application**

The following points are also to be noted if new claims are filed:

1. The features which, in combination, are part of the prior art (see publication D1) should be incorporated in the preamble of the independent claim (PCT Rule 6.3(b)(i) and (ii)).
2. To fulfill the requirements of PCT Rule 5.1(a)(ii), the description is to cite publications D1 and D2 and is to briefly outline the relevant prior art contained therein.
3. At the time of filing amended claims, the applicant is to also adapt the description to the amended claims (PCT Rule 5.1(a)(iii)). In revising the application, in particular the introductory part and the representation of the object or the advantages of the invention, the applicant should be careful not to introduce subject matter which goes beyond the content of the originally filed version of the application (PCT Articles 19(2) and 34(2)(b)).

**WRITTEN OPINION  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET)**

**International application No.**

**PCT/EP2004/051042**

4. To facilitate the examination of an amended application in view of PCT Articles 19(2) and 34(2)(b), the applicant is requested to submit the amendments made on replacement sheets (PCT Rule 66.8(a)) and to indicate the passages in the originally filed application on which these amendments are based.

The applicant is also reminded that the examiner in the PCT procedure is not allowed to make even very minor amendments (PCT Rule 66.8(a)).